

AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached new drawing sheet includes a replacement sheet for FIG. 3. The amendments to FIG. 3 find support in paragraph [0011] as well as original claim 4 of the specification.

Attachment: 1 Replacement Drawing Sheet

REMARKS

In the Official Action mailed on **06 June 2008**, the Examiner reviewed claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24. Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a). Examiner rejected claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17, and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner rejected claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) based on Traversat et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0184357, hereinafter “Traversat”).

Objections to Drawings

Examiner objected to the drawings arguing that the drawings did not show every feature of the invention specified in the claims.

Applicant has attached a replacement sheet for FIG. 3. In the replacement sheet, FIG. 3 been amended in accordance with the Examiner’s comments as well as amendments to the claims in the present response. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the objection to the drawings.

Amendments to the Specification

Applicant has amended paragraph [0029] of the specification to clarify that after invalidating a service record at step 324 of FIG. 3, the system invalidates a child record of the service record at step 325. This finds support in paragraph [0011] of the specification as well as original claim 4.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Examiner has objected to claims 1, 4, 9, 12, 17, and 20 as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Applicant has canceled claims 4, 12, and 20, and amended claims 1, 9, and 17. Support for the amendments to the independent claims can be found in

paragraph [0011] of the specification, and claims 4, 12, and 20 of the original claim set. Applicant respectfully submits that these amendments overcome the rejection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-17, and 19-24 were rejected as being anticipated by Traversat. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Specifically, in embodiments of the present invention, invalidating a resource record further comprises **invalidating a child resource record of the resource record**. Thus, embodiments of the present invention retrieve a resource record from a local cache, and send one or more queries for the resource. Upon not receiving a response to the queries within a pre-determined amount of time, embodiments of the present invention invalidate the resource record (see instant application, paragraphs [0029]-[0030]). These embodiments subsequently invalidate child resource records of the resource record (see instant application, paragraph [0011] as well as original claim 4). This is beneficial because it speeds up the deletion of stale information within the local cache, ensuring that the local cache maintains valid resource records.

In the sections of Traversat cited by Examiner in support of the rejection of original claim 4 (see Office Action, page 4), Traversat discloses:

- (1) using service advertisements to access network services (see Traversat, par. [0295]);
- (2) handling discovery messages, wherein rendezvous nodes either supply a service advertisement in response to the discovery message or forward the discovery message to other rendezvous nodes (see Traversat, par. [0300]-[0303]); and
- (3) publishing service advertisements at a client, wherein the service advertisements are held in a rendezvous node for a predetermined amount of time (i.e., a “TTL”) before being deleted and the service advertisements

are used by the rendezvous node to respond to discovery messages (see Traversat, par. [0315]-[0319]).

Nothing in the cited sections, or anywhere else in Traversat, discloses sending one or more queries based on a resource record and invalidating the resource record if a response is not received to the query in a predetermined time, **and subsequently invalidating child resource records** of invalidated resource records.

Independent claims 1, 9, and 17, have been amended to clarify that invalidating a resource record further comprises **invalidating a child resource record of the resource record**. This finds support in paragraphs [0011] of the specification as well as in original claims 4, 12, and 20. Dependent claims 4, 12, and 20 have been canceled without prejudice. No new matter has been added.

Hence, Applicant respectfully submits that independent claims 1, 9, and 17 as presently amended are in condition for allowance. Applicant also submits that the dependent claims which depend upon the independent claims are for the same reasons in condition for allowance and for reasons of the unique combinations recited in such claims.

CONCLUSION

It is submitted that the application is presently in form for allowance.
Such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Anthony Jones /
Anthony Jones
Registration No. 59,521

Date: 8 September 2008

Anthony Jones
Park, Vaughan & Fleming LLP
2820 Fifth Street
Davis, CA 95618-7759
Tel: (530) 759-1666
Fax: (530) 759-1665
Email: tony@parklegal.com